
Los Padres Objection Issue Summary – Trails/Recreation

Objectors:

- **California Off Road Vehicle Association**

Summary:

The objectors disagree with designating BCNM with BC corridors in the Sespe-Frazier IRA to allow for the existing motorized route system. They requested BC area designation or wider corridors for route maintenance or rerouting in the future.

Review Team Analysis:

The landscape and level of OHV development varies substantially throughout the Sespe-Frazier IRA. Some sections of the Sespe-Frazier are remote and others are dominated by OHV use (Los Padres Draft ROD, pp. 18-19).

Alternatives 2, 2a, and 3 include corridors that vary in width in areas with known problems. Increasing the corridor width for all roads for the purpose of a possible reroute in the future would unnecessarily decrease the acreage of BCNM and RW land allocations (FSEIS, pg. 22). The 200' corridor was selected to allow for flexibility for road management and maintenance and in some areas wider corridors were retained to address route problems.

Roads shown on the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) were retained with 200' corridors (LPNF Draft ROD, pg. 3). The roads and trails that are shown in Appendix 1G of the FSEIS are currently part of the National Forest Transportation System and buffers are established along the existing managed route system. While reroutes may be needed, it is not prudent to assume that a reroute would occur or the location of the reroute until NEPA analysis has been completed and a decision made. Project specific analysis would include any required plan amendments to adjust zone boundaries, MVUM updates, Travel Analysis, and resource analysis as required by NEPA. "The best approach in our view is to work through any site specific issues, relocation proposals, or other new opportunities through the normal project level planning and analysis process. Any project would need to be consistent with the Roadless Area Conservation Rule (RACR), which does allow relocation of roads for resource protection under conditions outlined in the RACR (see 36 CFR 294.12)" (FSEIS, Appendix 4, comment #77, pg. 84-88).

REMEDY(S) PROPOSED BY OBJECTORS

"If additional BCNM zoning is required to comply with the terms of the settlement agreement we contend that a minimum 300 ft buffer for all system roads and trails should be established to allow for trail reroutes and/or trail relocation in the future should this become necessary to maintain the routes of travel. We have included site specific recommendations for the Black Mountain, Garcia, Machesna, and Sespe-Fraiser IRA's below. These should be considered for all system roads and trails adjacent to or passing through BCNM zones areas."

“The Sespe Fraiser IRA includes one of the best motorized trail systems in the country. There is low route density and the trails have sustainable design. If BCNM zoning is adopted it would not be possible to do rerouting or relocation of trail sections without a Plan Amendment. This severely constrains any future modifications of the trail system.”

INSTRUCTIONS BEING CONSIDERED

- No instructions are recommended.